

962
Salopienus K
DIOTREPES RE-ADMONISHED:

OR SOME

R E M A R K S

O N

THE SECOND EDITION

O F A

L E T T E R

From the Author of PIETAS OXONIENSIS

To the Rev. Dr. ADAMS of Shrewsbury;

Occasioned by his SERMON,

ENTITLED

A Test of true and false Doctrines.

Wherein Dr. Adams, the Church of England, and
some evangelical Doctrines, are vindicated from
the Misrepresentations of the Letter-writer.

By a Parishioner of St. Chad's,

And Author of DIOTREPES ADMONISHED.

De gratia universali, aliisque Quæstionibus longe difficillimis, optimi viri et doctissimi Theologi idem per omnia haudquaquam sentiunt. *Ecclesia Anglicana* optimo Consilio, exemplo ab omnibus imitando, nullius Conscientiæ, his in Rebus, jugum imponit. Quæ de illis in Articulis suis statuerit, talia sunt, ut ab omnibus ex æquo admittantur. His contenta, nec ipsa aliquid amplius requirit curiosius statuere. Hinc summa inter nos Pax cum sobria sentiendi libertate conjuncta.

Abp. Wake Ep. ad Pastores Genev.

L O N D O N :

PRINTED for B. WHITE, Fleet-Street; and
T. CADELL, in the Strand. 1770.

[Price ONE SHILLING.]



3 Ep. *John*, 9, 10.

I wrote unto the Church: but DIOTREPHES, who loveth to have the pre-eminence among them, receiveth us not. Wherefore if I come, I will remember his deeds which he doeth, prating against us with malicious words: and not content therewith, neither doth he himself receive the brethren, and forbiddeth them that would, and casteth them out of the Church.

R E M A R K S

O N

T H E S E C O N D E D I T I O N

O F A

L E T T E R to the Rev. Dr. *ADAMS*, &c.

S I R,

YOU will probably wonder to hear from me again, as I had, in my former address, expressed my intention to proceed no further in this Controversy. But I had not seen the second Edition of your Letter to the Rev. Dr. *Adams*, till that was nearly printed. The additions therein made have forced me, very much against my inclination, to take up my pen again, in order to vindicate the Dr. from the further aspersions you have thrown upon him; and to defend, as far as I am able, some important doctrines of the Gospel and the Church of *England*, from your additional

B

mis-

misrepresentations. In the former address, I made some allowances for the haste in which you wrote your letter to the Dr. as it stood in the first edition, and imputed some instances of acrimony to that. But your second edition shows, that time does not cool the ardour of your spirit, nor moderate the severity of your language, where your favourite Tenets and Preachers are concerned. You have now had (if I may use your own words concerning the Dr. p. 42, which confirm this remark) a considerable time "to cook up your second edition for the Press:" and tho' I am not much solicitous about "the slovenly garb in which it appears, nor the want of method, tautology, and inaccuracies of grammar" which are to be found in it: yet I hoped, that a little Reflection would have made you more mild in your censures and temperate in your language. But you really wax worse and worse, and prove the truth of what the Dr. hath observed, that "men, whose passions are stronger than their reason, will be guilty of excess in religion as well as in other things. A zeal for Opinions frequently makes men conclude *their own* cause

cause to be the cause of God. Where men are, as is frequent, divided into Parties by Opinion, their prejudices will be heightened by pride and resentment. They will hearken greedily to every thing that favours their System, and be obstinately deaf to every thing that opposeth it.”*

Your advice in the Dedication to me, and my fellow-parishioners, is indeed excellent, and I thank you for it: “Receive nothing upon man’s authority; weigh every thing you hear in the balance of God’s unerring word; bring it to the Law and to the Testimony: above all, be careful not to search the Scriptures by halves, nor without earnest Prayer, &c.” I hope we shall take the seasonable advice you have added, “not to be affrighted by bug-bear names;” and shall not think the worse of our Minister, for the bug-bear names which you so plentifully bestow upon him and his doctrines. You advise us to remember that “it is no proof of the truth of any doctrine, that either great names or multitudes are found to be the abettors of it.” I hope we shall remember this also, and not be influenced in our judgment of

* Essay against *Hume*, p. 64, 101. 3d Ed.

the Scriptures by the great names of the Reformers and Compilers of the Liturgy, nor by the great and majestick name of *James I.* in his declaration prefixed to the Articles ; nor by the great names of the protestant Churches abroad ; but shall fairly search our Bibles with attention, impartiality and prayer, as you and our Church direct us to do : especially since she reminds us with a truly maternal caution, (Article xix.) that some renowned Churches “ have erred, not only in Ceremonies but matters of Faith.” And that “ even general Councils (which contain more in number and are supposed to have higher authority than a few Reformers or an *English* Convocation) may err and sometimes have erred, even in things pertaining to God,” (Art. xxi.) and therefore we are not to follow her implicitly.

I have no more doubt than you have p. 5. Ed. 2. that Dr. *Adams* “ read and considered the word of God with attention before he entered into the Ministry ; and that he also firmly believed that all the fundamental truths of the Scriptures were contained in the articles, homilies, and liturgy of the Church of *England*.” But that he

he believed those articles, &c. to be, in the sense of the Compilers, in every respect and point agreeable to the Word of God is another thing, and not necessarily implied in his subscription and assent to them.

The question is, what is the sense, which the Church of *England* now puts upon these articles. It is not so easy to determine who is *the Church*. But it seems reasonable that we should form our judgment of her sense, from the writings and preaching of the Governours and Dignitaries of it. The Rulers of the State, considered as a Body, appear to be in the same sentiments with them, by the persons they promote to the first Dignities in the Church, and by their allowing a sense to be put upon the articles different from that of the Compilers, and which from hence may be supposed to be their own sense of them. So that it seems pretty clear, that the sense of the *present* Church of *England* concerning these points, is different from the sense of the Church two Centuries ago. “ The Church therefore and the Dr. may be of accord, p. 7.” It may be said, if this is the Case, why are not the terms of ministerial conformity altered?
ed?

ed? Dr. *Adams* hath observed, S. p. 35 *note*, that " there have been, and may still subsist, many difficulties in the way of attempting this alteration in our national Church." The zealous and blind attachment of multitudes to every thing, which hath been long established, may prevent the Legislature from repealing some injurious Statutes, and changing oaths, subscriptions and forms, which they esteem an infringement upon the rights of conscience, and detrimental to the true interest of Church and State. They may think it better to allow a seeming or real contradiction to them, without legally animadverting upon it, than to run the hazard of disturbing the peace of both by the attempt. There was a remarkable instance of this in *Ireland* in the year 1745: During the Rebellion the assistance of the Presbyterians, who are numerous and wealthy in the north of *Ireland*, was much wanted, especially to serve as officers in the Militia. The Parliament of *Ireland* did not think it prudent at that time, to remove their legal incapacity, arising from the *sacramental Test*; but came to this unanimous resolution, " that such of the
Pro-

Protestant Dissenters, as had accepted Commissions in the Militia, or acted under the Commissions of Array, had thereby done good service to his Majesty and their Country; and that any person who shall commence any prosecution against any Protestant, who hath accepted of, or shall accept of, or act under, such Commissions, shall be deemed an enemy to his Majesty, and a friend to the Pretender."—Nor doth "*every man*, who hath been witness to Dr. *Adams's* declaration necessarily conclude, that he is fully persuaded of the strict harmony there is between the sacred oracles of truth and the Articles, Homilies, and Liturgy" in the sense put upon them by the Compilers and Reformers. I am persuaded that the generality of the Laity, who think of these matters at all, consider subscriptions and declarations in a different light, even as agreeing with the *present* Church of *England* in her sense of them. Nor do they view Dr. *Adams* and others of different Sentiments from you, in the odious light, in which you paint them.

You have added, p. 9, that "he esteems it an erroneous doctrine to maintain, that man stands in need of a Redeemer

deemer of INFINITE DIGNITY to atone for his sins :” And this you repeat again, p. 34, 40. But a person may firmly believe, that depraved sinful man stands in need of a Satisfaction or Atonement to be made for him, by some glorious Person or Being, appointed of God his offended Sovereign, without seeing that he stands in need of a Redeemer of *infinite Dignity*: he cannot therefore be said to deny the Atonement of Christ. Dr. *Clark* hath well vindicated the Atonement of Christ in his *treatise of revealed Religion*, and several of his Sermons. A judicious defence of that Doctrine entitled *Jesus Christ the Mediator, &c.* was written by one *Tomkins*, an *Arian*; which defence, a noted writer in favour of the commonly received opinion concerning the Trinity represents, as a valuable and excellent Treatise. Nothing appears to me plainer, than that a person may believe “original sin, the divinity of Christ, and the atonement which he made” p. 10, and yet not see the necessity of the Redeemer’s being a person of *infinite* dignity. If that phrase be understood in its natural proper sense, one would think it could only refer to
the

the only true, supreme and infinite God, who could not possibly suffer and die.* But doth the Scripture any where expressly say, that it is Self-existence, supreme Godhead, or Equality with the Father, that alone can make Christ a proper and sufficient atonement for sin? Where doth the text stand? The above-mentioned writers allow, that the Lord Jesus Christ was so glorious a Being, and possessed of such Dignity, as to be employed by the Father in creating the World and its Inhabitants. Is there not then Dignity, Worth, and Merit in the maker, sufficient to redeem the work of his own hands? The Scripture no where annexeth the Idea of *Infinite* to the Doctrine of Satisfaction.

Your note [E] p. 10, is indeed very extraordinary. You begin it with (what in the Dr's. case you call, p. 18, " a sort of triumphal challenge," " *defying* him to prove that his principles now *are* or *ever have* been tolerated by Law in *any* Nation under Heaven." " A modest Reader (as the Dr. hath observed concerning Mr.

* Yet Mr. *Romaine* asserted at St. *Chad's* that he did: and probably this was one of the more exceptionable Tenets to which Dr. *Adams* referred.

*Hume**) can scarce look such assurance as this in the face: he will be apt to mistrust his own apprehension, and think there is more in these big words than he readily fees. The first reading gave me suspicions of this kind; but, having recovered myself, and taken courage to review them, I fear not to assert and prove the contrary." By *his Principles*, I suppose you mean the *Arian, Pelagian, Socinian, and Arminian* Tenets, agreeable to your account of them in your *Appendix*; with what justice I will not here enquire. The expression *tolerated by law*, is a little ambiguous: but that these Tenets have been embraced, countenanced and propagated by great multitudes of learned and eminent men is notorious; and that they were tolerated at various times and in many places is equally so.—You have undoubtedly read of the vast spread of *Arianism*; insomuch that one of the Fathers says, "the whole World wondered to see itself become *Arian*." Several of the Emperors espoused, established, and defended it. The *Vandals* in *Africa*, the *Spaniards*, *Burgun-*

* Essay p. 16. 3d Ed.

dians,

dians, and *Suevi* maintained its principles. In short, *Africa* and *Italy* were almost entirely *Arian* in the sixth Century. From that time to the present day, Tenets nearly resembling those of the ancient *Arians*, and quite different from what you would call the orthodox Faith, are held by the *Nestorians*, *Armenians*, and other Christians who are numerous in *Asia* and *Africa*, especially *Abyssinia*; and have no Laws to censure and controul them. I may in this connection mention *Russia* and the whole *Greek Church*, who differ from the *Nicene* and *Athanasian* Creeds and yet their Tenets are tolerated, yea established: and the *Greeks* and *Armenians* are tolerated to this day at *Venice*, and many other places.

As to the *Pelagians*; tho' the Sect as called by that name was soon extinguished, yet there arose another in the fifth Century, called *Semi-pelagians*, who differed from what you call the Doctrines of the Church of *England*. Their principles the *Greeks* and the *eastern* Christians embraced, and still firmly adhere to them: and so these may properly be said to be tolerated by law.—As to the *Socinians*, they were established in *Poland*, A. D. 1600, under

the toleration and protection of a noble *Pole*, in whose District they had a Church and University, as well as in other places of that Kingdom: and when they were expelled from thence, it was more for being *Protestants* than *Socinians*, and thro' the growing power of the *Papists*. Their principles made their way into *Transylvania*, A. D. 1563. The Prince, and the greatest part of the Nobility, of that Province, espoused their cause; and a privilege was allowed them to profess and propagate their Doctrines in a publick manner. Under the successive Dukes of *Transylvania* the same liberty was allowed them. To this Day they profess their Religion publicly in that Province, and their Churches and Seminaries of Learning are protected by law and the faith of certain Treaties. They had for a while an Establishment in *Germany* and *Denmark*, by the toleration of the King of *Denmark*, the Duke of *Holstein* and the Elector-Palatine in the last Century. Many of this Sect were afterwards incorporated with the *General-Baptists* and the *Collegiants*, who are still tolerated in *Holland*.—We now come to the *Arminians*, who from the first

first had, and still have, a Church in the Dutchy of *Holstein* under the protection of the Duke. They are tolerated in *Holland*, having thirty four Churches and eighty four Pastors, and places of Education for their Students. Tho' that Community, which makes an external profession of their peculiar Doctrines, is thought to be on the decline, yet they spread daily, infect many of the Pastors of the established Churches of *Holland* and *Germany*; and the votaries of those Doctrines in *Geneva* and many parts of *Switzerland* are certainly very numerous. King *James I.* (you have told us) sent five eminent Divines to the Synod of *Dort*, where the Doctrines of *Arminius* were condemned: Yet scarce had these Divines returned, but the King, together with the greatest part of the episcopal Clergy, discovered in the strongest terms their dislike of the proceedings of this Synod, and judged the Sentiments of *Arminius* relating to the Divine Decrees preferable to those of *Calvin*; and the Clergy's preaching those Tenets was allowed.—There is another circumstance, which deserves, in this connection, peculiar attention. In the last Century

Century a form of Doctrine called the *Consensus* agreeable to the principles of *Calvin*, and the articles of the Church of *England*, received the authority of some Magistrates in *Switzerland*, and the Clergy were required to subscribe it. But A. D. 1686 the Canton of *Basil*, thro' the solicitation of many of the Clergy and of the Elector of *Brandenburg*, abrogated this form. Others say, that it was not abrogated by a positive Edict, but no Subscription to it was required from the Clergy or Candidates for the Ministry. It met with the same fate at *Geneva*, 1706, and there is an admirable speech of Dr. *Turretine* in defence of its being laid aside, in *Candler's Case of Subscriptions*. In 1718 the assent of the Clergy in the Canton of *Berne* to the *Consensus*, was again required by the Magistrates. As no demand of that kind had been made for a long time, warm contests arose about it. King *George I.* and the *States General* interposed to terminate the dissention; and with such success, that this formulary lost much of its credit and authority, and is now in disuse.—So that on the whole, I think it may be justly said, that what you call Dr. *Adams's* Tenets

nets are tolerated in *Switzerland* and even *Geneva* itself. More particulars relating to the establishment or toleration of each of these Sects, may be found in the ecclesiastical Historians, especially in *Mosheim*. I am sorry to take up so much of my Readers' time on this subject: but I was willing to show them, how little dependance there is to be had on your confident assertions and the aspersions which you ground upon them.

You say p. 10, that "you can produce Examples without number, of the abhorrence with which his Tenets have *always* been received, ever since the planting of Christianity." But I think you must pass over at least two Centuries, before you can produce one. The account I have just given of the reception, spread, and toleration of those Tenets, will show how unjustly you assert p. 62, that "Doctrines, the reverse of those, have *ever* been esteemed the leading principles of Religion; that the *whole* catholic Church hath *unanimously* condemned the denial of them, and would not even allow the deniers the name of *Christian*, &c." At the end of your Note, p. 11, you add, that "the Doctrines contained in Dr. *Adams's* Sermon have *always* been deemed

deemed worthy of publick censure." This assertion I have plainly disproved. But supposing it were true, this doth not evince their falshood. Will not the same Argument prove the truth of all the Tenets of *Popery* or the *Koran*? For all the doctrines that contradict them, have been deemed by *Papists* and *Mahometans* worthy of publick censure. To argue the truth of a doctrine, because the many embrace it, or to deny its truth, because they reject it, is absurd. The *Papists* make this one mark of their being the true Church, viz. "Amplitude, and the multitude and variety of Believers which are in it." This Argument would be as strong in favour of *Mahometanism*, and stronger in behalf of *Paganism*. Your argument rather proves, that Dr. *Adams's* Tenets are true. "When the Truth is proposed with the greatest clearness and the greatest advantage, its votaries, at all times and in all places, have been but few. But who-ever will stand up on the side of Error, how-ever wild and absurd his opinions and conduct may be, he will hardly fail of obtaining adherents."* *All the World wondered after the Beast.* Rev. xiii. 3.

* *Newton* (of *Olney's*) Review of Eccl. Hist. p. 348.

In p. 13, you quote a passage from the Dr's Sermon p. 40, [Ed. 2d, p. 39] and suppose by the expression of an *obscure light*, he means the Scripture, and say, "you cannot otherwise make any sense of what he hath advanced." The Dr's words are, "let us ever interpret the *more difficult passages* of Scripture by those that are *clear and evident*. Let us not wrest those into Articles of faith; or with *this obscure light* in our hands, presume to enter into the counsels of providence." But I appeal to the common sense of every candid reader, whether by this *obscure light* the Dr. did not mean, the *more difficult passages of Scripture* and not the Scripture itself. The whole Sermon proves this. Now those *difficult passages* are comparatively an obscure light; or else there would not have been so much controversy between learned and pious men about them. But you seem willing to put the worst interpretation on this passage, to lay a foundation for that illiberal sneer, with which the note concludes. Would any one but you think the following passage *very obscure and intricated*; which seems exactly parallel to the Doctor's:

D

" When

“ When we have disputed and contended till we are weary, and wrangled the Church into flames and ashes, yet that which God hath spoken *obscurely* and so left *difficult* in itself, will remain *difficult* still; and that which is *difficult* thro’ the weakness and incapacity of unlearned men, will be far better cleared by a rational explication than by a Canon. O that the Lord may persuade us not to be wise above what is written, but to acknowledge that, which is *unrevealed* in the word to be *beyond us*, and that which is more *darkly* revealed to be more doubtful to us!”

In note [Y] p. 20, you say, “ the Dr. will not assert, that all, or any, are restored, by Christ’s obedience, from natural death to natural life again.” But is not this the very thing which the Dr. asserts? “ As by the first man’s disobedience all men became mortal, so by the obedience of Christ, the weight of this sentence is removed, and all are restored to life again.” He adds S. p. 33, [Ed. 2d, p. 32] “ And to the hope of a happy immortality.” *Adam* forfeited life by his disobedience: all his posterity in consequence

quence of his fall are liable to natural death. In consequence of Christ's obedience, they shall all be raised to life again. If they do not value and improve the hope of a happy immortality, and in consequence do not rise to eternal life, the fault is their own. They rise to life: whether it may be called *natural* life or no, is a question about a word. And it seems to me, that by a kind of quibble, you reduce him first to an absurdity, and then charge him with inconsistency.

I almost repent that, in my former address, I desired you to try your hand at reasoning; since I perceive what a poor hand you have at it. The Dr. says, "let me ask, if we have not the power of doing good, have we the power of doing evil? But this power cannot be without the other." Let us now see how you begin, p. 23, "what reasoning is this for the great Champion of all reasoners?" It is plain you do not intend this as a compliment to the Dr. but a sneer. And by what authority or on what foundation, you *honour* him with this title, appears not. I presume you do not call this *reasoning*. Now let us see how you *do rea-*

son. " You might as well have asked, whether a stone has not the property of swimming, because it has that of sinking, and then say, that the one cannot be without the other; for the heart of man as naturally follows its own corrupt bias, as a stone sinks when thrown into the Water." Were you to ask the lowest mechanic or labourer in the parish, whether there was any difference between the powers of a stone, a piece of lifeless, inactive, insensible matter, and of a human creature, a rational soul, and a moral agent; if he did not insult you for the affront offered to *his* understanding, he would secretly pity the weakness of *yours*. Is there any comparison between these two objects? A stone, strictly speaking, hath neither *the property* of sinking nor swimming. It sinks merely thro' the attraction or impulsion of gravity, not by any innate or acquired property or power. But is Man such a creature? Hath not God made him higher and wiser than the stones or the beasts? Hath he not yet wisdom, understanding, and liberty of choice, notwithstanding his corrupt bias? Besides, you beg the question

question, when you take it for granted, that this bias is so strong, that he cannot move in the least towards God and Heaven. This is denied, and this you were to prove. Reason, Experience and Scripture concur to show, that man hath some power to turn his thoughts to this or the other Subject, and to do good or evil Actions. If he hath not a natural power to do good; if his corrupt bias draws him irresistibly to do evil, just as Gravity forces a Stone downwards, it is most plain that he cannot be guilty of sin. For as Dr. *Adams* hath observed, nothing is, or can be, morally good or evil, but what is voluntary and the effect of choice; or else a Stone might be called a good or evil Agent, as well as a Man. If *free to evil* and *not free to good*, be not a contradiction in terms, I scarce know what is. As this is an important point, let us consider it a little further. God commands men in his word, to *cease to do evil*, and *learn to do well*; to *repent and be converted*; to *consider and show themselves men*; to *turn themselves and make them new hearts*; to *believe in the Lord Jesus Christ*, &c. &c. Now doth not this
 imply

imply something at least of a power to do thus? Let the power be weakened by a corrupt bias and bad habit and custom, yet it is not quite lost; else such exhortations would be a solemn mockery. Did not St. *Peter* exhort *Simon Magus* to repent and pray, tho' he knew him to be in the bond of iniquity? Do not your favourite preachers exhort sinners to repent and believe, to pray for pardoning mercy, and renewing Grace? I know some of them do. Doth not this imply, that they believe them to have *some* power? Would they thus exhort a Stone? How, upon your supposition, are men in a state of trial? Why have they life and death set before them? If they have no power over their own actions, or no direction of that power, why are they exhorted and persuaded? how will they be judged at last? Is not that a strange Tenet, which at once defeats all the exhortations of the Bible, rendereth the labours of your own preachers both needless and ridiculous, and overthrows the grand doctrine of a future Judgment? If any, upon your principles, become holy and good, it must be by force, and as that famous *Antinomian*, Dr. *Crisp*,

Crisp, expresseth it, "It is as a Physician poureth Physic down the Patient's throat, and so it works against his will." You believe that Dr. *Adams* hath "a smattering of Philosophy," p. 23, and it is kind in *you* to allow him that. But from your way of reasoning, it may naturally be concluded, that you have scarce a smattering of Divinity or Philosophy either. I do not deny, nor doth the Dr. deny, the necessity of the help of divine Grace to enlighten and sanctify the hearts of sinful men. But there is no inconsistency between asserting that necessity, and asserting that man hath a natural power to do something, to take some steps, towards this blessed effect. He may have a natural propensity to evil; yet it may not be so strong but that he may be capable of desiring, praying, and attempting to correct it, and to become wise and good: else I cannot understand the Apostle's exhortation and motive when he says, "work out your own salvation with fear and trembling, for it is God who worketh in you to will and to do of his good pleasure," *Phil.* ii. 12, 13. You have a natural, or rather an acquired, propensity,

penfity, to censure and malign fuch men as Dr. *Adams* : yet I am perfuaded you have fome good propenfities in your heart ; and if I thought you had not a power in fome meafure to conquer this evil propenfity, provided you fet about it in time, I fhould never think of addreffing you.

In your note p. 25——27, you go on more dark, and, which is ufually the cafe, more confident, in your arguing and censures of the Dr. He had faid that “ for greater crimes upon our fincere repentance and amendment we fhall be forgiven, and in fome degree reftored to favour.” Here you obferve, that “ the expreffion *in fome degree* at leaft implies, that if we have been great finners we fhall not be *entirely* reftored to favour.” The Dr. adds, “ but for the infirmities of nature, the righteoufnefs of God will make merciful allowances.”* Then you exclaim, “ O foothering fong to the pride of man, fuch doctrine can never want admirers. But in this there is not one word of Chrift.” True ; but is there nothing of him in the

* Exod. xxxiv. 6, 7. Pfalm lxxviii. 38, 39.
—ciii. 8—15. Heb. iv. 15, 16. & fim.

rest of the Sermon? You know there is, and in this very connection too: "that pardon and peace are to be obtained thro' Christ; that (which, by the way, explains what he means by being in *some degree* restored to favour) not only pardon but that latitude of grace and favour, which is implied in the Christian salvation, that is, restoring the penitent to the hope of heaven and immortality, is always represented in the writings of the Apostles, as procured for us by the merits of Christ," S. p. 18. Is yours fair reasoning, or a just representation? I agree with you, that "the greatest sinners upon their repentance and faith shall have a full, free, and perfect pardon thro' Christ." But that they shall "stand as high in the favour of God, as the most exalted Saint that ever lived," I deny. For the Scripture saith, that God will render to every man *according to his works; his deeds; the fruit of his doings*; that every man shall receive his *own reward* for his *own labour*; he that soweth bountifully shall reap bountifully; &c.— "God views them (you say) as they are in his Son." This is too mysterious for my comprehension. I find no such declaration

E
tion

tion in Scripture. This is an *Antinomian* Tenet, and from thence this *precious* consequence hath been drawn, that “ God sees no sin in his elect, in his people ;” and I heard one of your sort of preachers boldly declare in the pulpit, that “ the affection of Christ is not alienated from his people by their greatest provocations ;” which was both nonsense and blasphemy. May I not more justly use your exclamation, “ O soothing song to the wickedness of man ; such doctrine can never want admirers.” God sees men and their true characters as they really are. And tho’ he grants a full pardon to every penitent believer, yet those who have been great sinners are not so *entirely* restored to favour, as to possess all that peace, consolation and joy in the Holy Ghost in this life, and that measure and degree of future felicity, which persons of less degrees of guilt and greater attainments in holiness, shall enjoy. This is all Dr. *Adams* means : and it is impossible in the nature of things, especially of the soul of man, and under the moral government of a holy God, that it should be otherwise.— You add, “ he looks not at less or greater degrees

degrees of guilt. He loves his people, *not for their own sakes*, but for the sake of him in whom they are always complete." What an Idea of the infinitely righteous God doth this suggest! But doth not the Scripture most plainly declare, that God loves his people *for their own sakes*, and so far as they are his people? "The righteous Lord loveth righteousness, his countenance beholdeth the upright. He takes pleasure in his saints—in his people." Particular mention is made of several, whom it is said "he loved,—who had done good, and right in his sight,—who had found grace and favour in his sight. *Enoch* had this testimony, that he pleased God. Your charity is a sacrifice *well pleasing* to God. With such sacrifices God is *well pleased*. Children obey your Parents, for this is *well pleasing* to God. We receive what we ask, because we keep his commandments, and do those things that are *pleasing in his sight*. Christ always did the things that *pleased* God: and for whose sake was he beloved? Do not interpret this, as if I meant to make any comparison between the holiness of Christ and his People,

as to *its degree*, or in the least to degrade his character. His obedience was perfect ; he was compleatly holy. Therefore God was perfectly pleased with him, and loved him above all other Beings. The Angels are holy Creatures, who “ do God’s commandments, hearkening to the voice of his word.” And so far he loves them *for their own sakes*, tho’ they are comparatively chargeable with folly. Where there is a prevailing principle of faith and love in any human Beings, which produces obedience to the divine commands, he must love them *for their own sakes*, according to the degree in which this Principle prevails in their Hearts, and operates in their lives ; for the same reason as he loves his holy Child Jesus, and loves his holy Angels : for his love to his Children must always be greater or less, according to the degree in which they resemble their Father ; or else he could not be an omniscient, just, and holy Being. The Scripture urgeth us “ to labour that we may be *approved* of God :—— the Apostles studied to show themselves *approved* of God. He hath also expressed his approbation of particular works and services
done

done by his people, in places too numerous to be mentioned; and when they die, their works follow them." Nothing is more apparent from Scripture, than that God loves his people *for their own sakes*, when, and in proportion to the degree in which, they are renewed in righteousness and true holiness: and it is impossible he should do otherwise. That "the most exalted Saint that ever lived" St. *Paul* for instance, should be no more the object of God's love, than a Sinner just converted, the penitent Thief for instance, is contrary to the united voice of Reason and Scripture. That God should love *Moses*, *David*, St. *Peter* and St. *John* no more, and make them no happier hereafter, than four Infants, who died before the commission of actual sin, or they were capable of any rational Actions; what an absurd and monstrous doctrine is this? "How destructive is this (to use your own words p. 31) of all our notions of the nature and attributes of God, and therefore cannot be admitted as agreeable to his holy word?" And what a discouragement is this to all attempts to grow in grace and go on to perfection?

In

In p. 31, you quote the following passage from the Dr's Sermon p. 20, " It will be said that faith is the substitute of good works, and the only stipulated condition of acceptance with God." To this you answer, " I know nobody that ever said any such thing." Now, tho' the persons, whose errors he is considering, may not say this in express words, yet they in effect say it, or are understood by many to mean it, when they speak so highly of faith in general without giving any definition of it, or the definition mentioned below, and speak so slightly of good works. Any one would think, this was the sense of the compilers of the Homilies when they say, " this is the Ordinance of God, that they which believe in Christ should be *saved without works*, by faith *only*, freely receiving the remission of their sins" p. 41. As to the other expression, that " faith is the only stipulated condition of acceptance with God," it appears to me that one of the Homilies saith it, according to your quotation p. 41, " the *only* mean and instrument of salvation required on our parts, is *faith*, *i. e.* a sure trust and confidence in the mercies of God, whereby we *persuade*

suade ourselves, that God both hath and will forgive our sins." This account of faith I take it for granted you approve. But where doth the Scripture give us this definition of justifying or saving faith, that it is "persuading ourselves, that God hath forgiven our sins?" Nay, it is a contradiction in terms. If to believe that he is forgiven, be the mean of a person's justification, he must believe he is forgiven, before he is forgiven. He must believe he is forgiven, and yet is not forgiven till he believes it. Whereas, a person must be a true believer in order to his pardon or justification, before he can, or ought to believe, that he is pardoned. This is the definition of faith, which the *Antinomians* give, as might easily be shown. But *Calvin*, and I believe most of the other Reformers deny, that Assurance or inward persuasion of our being forgiven, or in a justified state, is of the essence of faith. Many may and alas, do persuade themselves that their sins are forgiven, who are yet in their sins. And many true Christians have not this persuasion. But I will spend no more words on this absurd and dangerous Tenet, only ask one ques-

question, whether this single passage in the Homilies may not justly make any serious Clergyman scruple to declare, that “ they contain a godly and wholesome doctrine ?”——You add, “ Faith receives Christ, and with him, love to God and his commandments.” This is dark. If you mean, that one who truly believes in Christ will see himself obliged by his authority, commands and grace, to love God and keep his commandments, and will be led to do it, this is what the Dr. hath asserted, S. p. 22, 23. If you mean any thing else, I understand it not.——You suppose, p. 42, that “ the Dr. makes obedience the root of faith, and not faith the root of obedience.” This is wrangling about a word. Another meaning may be easily *drawn out* of the passage you refer to. God commands men to believe in the name of his son. To believe, then, is an act of obedience to God, and proceeds from a principle of submission to him.* Whoever considers the Dr’s Idea of faith, as “ embracing the Gospel” and takes it “ in its whole extent,” as he ex-

* Rom. i. 15. xvi. 26.

presseth and describeth it, S. p. 21, will not find the passage *much* embarrassed. If you annex a different Idea to *faith*, you are not to judge of the Dr's meaning by your own Idea, but his. Otherwise (as you intimate) "perhaps the fault may be in you, that it appears unintelligible." We are too prone to be unwilling to understand what clashes with our favourite notions.

You are guilty of a misrepresentation, p. 39: You quote Dr. *Adams* as saying, "you want no assistance but the exercise of your own Reason." There you break off, and leave your Reader to fill up the blank. He says, "we want no other assistance in applying the first principles of nature and conscience, in order to our understanding what is truth, judging of the meaning of difficult texts, and of the reasoning of other men, and to detect their sophistry." Whereas you would lead your Readers to suppose, that the Dr. thought Reason could do every thing for us. This is not fair.

You are guilty of a grosser misrepresentation, p. 40. You say the Dr's real Creed is "the Scriptures no where speak

of imputed righteousness." But the Dr. saith no such thing. He says " they no where speak of the imputed righteousness of Christ." And it rests upon you to show where they do. But be careful, Sir, that you do not *talk wickedly and deceitfully even for God.* Job xiii. 7.

I may here introduce another misrepresentation. You say p. 61, " the Dr. makes it the very height of impiety to assert, that the sin of *Adam* is entailed on his posterity," S. p. 31. whereas he only says, " they have added this above all," that is, as the connection plainly shows, all their *mistakes* mentioned before. Here is not a word about the *height of impiety*; and in S. p. 33, 34, he strongly expresseth " his abhorrence of censuring and condemning all who embrace or propagate this, and other doctrines, which he apprehends to be false, and allows many among them to be eminent for their virtue and piety." Is not this a shameful perversion of his sense? Am I too blame in calling these *malicious words*?

In p. 43, note [G] you will not grant
 " that a latitude of subscription hath been
 claimed

claimed and allowed from the beginning." No stress ought to be laid on the Title to the Articles and the King's declaration prefixed to them; since it hath been generally agreed, that those are no part of the Clergy's subscription, * and have no authority in them. I doubt not but it may be made appear, that during the Reigns you mention, some of the Clergy wrote in a strain different from the plain, literal sense of the Articles. " Towards the latter end of Queen *Elizabeth's* Reign, there arose a Party, who were for overthrowing the received opinions concerning *Predestination, Perseverance, Free Will, Effectual Grace*, and the *Extent of Christ's Redemption*. The Clergy of the Episcopal Church began to lean towards the Notions, which *Arminius* some time after this, propagated concerning these intricate Points."† Surely you cannot with any propriety call Archbishop *Laud* and all his *Arminian* brethren, *some of a modern date*;

* There is a large and particular Account of this curious piece of political Theology which well deserves reading, in *Mosheim's Eccl. Hist.* Vol. iv. p. 519—521. 8vo. † *ib.* p. 128.

nor even Bp. *Sanderfon*, whose opinion I quoted before. Instances may be produced of an ancient date of some persons, who have *incurred a public censure* for adhering to the *plain literal sense* of the Articles. I will only mention one. King *Charles I.* issued a proclamation commanding the Clergy not to preach or dispute about the tenets of *Calvin* and *Arminius*. Bp. *Davenant*, presuming to preach upon Predestination, was severely reprimanded upon his knees by the Council, and hardly so escaped, tho' he alledged that he preached nothing but the 17th Article. When a public censure is likely to be incurred, no wonder Clergymen in general are unwilling to expose themselves to it. But Truth neither desires nor needs the support of public censures. Error flees to persecution, pains, and penalties.

In p. 45, 46, your note [K] is a most extraordinary one indeed. And if in humble imitation of your attempt to divert your Readers a little, with the Story of a real Enthusiast, I endeavour to relieve my Readers' attention by animadverting upon that exceptionable passage in a strain something resembling yours, I hope both they
and

and you will excuse me. I have long had a friendly correspondence with some of my worthy neighbours, who are not all of them of our Church. Since I read the latter part of this Note, I have been quite ashamed to go into their Company ; lest, as your Book is the subject of much conversation in the Parish, I should hear some very disagreeable remarks upon this Passage, and some reflections from thence thrown on the Church of *England*. You assert that “ our good forefathers at the time of the Reformation *builded* a Church on the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone. This Church they *walled round* with Articles, Homilies, and Liturgy, in order to keep out *Arians, Pelagians, Socinians, and Arminians.*” It is probable, that one of my neighbours, who is a Papist, will accost me thus : “ So, neighbour, I have often asked you the question, where was your Church before *Luther* ? And now here is the great *Shampion of the Shursh* (as the *Welchmen* used to call *Sacheverel*) publickly asserting, that “ our forefathers *builded* the Church of *England.*” He says indeed “ on the foundation

dation of the Apostles, &c." which I deny,
 for that was builded on before. Besides,
 both he and Mr. *Romaine* say, p. 64, 65,
 67, that " it is builded and established on
 the Basis of such and such doctrines."
 You see plainly that it is not the old
 Church, which Christ builded. Your Di-
 vines used to call it a *reformed* Church;
 but he makes it a *new* Church, builded
 about two Centuries ago: so that what
 was the Church of *England* before that
 time, was no other than our Church,
 our ancient, visible, catholic, apostolic
 Church, from which you have schismatic-
 cally separated. Hence it appears that your
 Church is no older than *Henry VIII.*"

While I am blushing for you, another
 neighbour, a Quaker, will probably thus
 address me: " Yea, friend, I have some-
 thing to say to thy Champion too. He
 says, " Our forefathers *walled round* this
 new built Church with *Articles, Homilies,*
&c." Hence thou seest, that he in effect
 acknowledgeth, what I have often told
 thee, that the Church of Christ and the
 Church of *England* are different Consti-
 tutions. Christ's Church is an old Church,
 builded by him, on a Rock, and the
Gates

Gates of Hell cannot prevail against it ; much less *Arians, Pelagians, &c.* It hath no walls to keep out enemies ; it needeth none ; for its divine almighty architect is its defence. Tho' the whole world was combined against it, it subsisted and flourished too, without any such Walls, for several Centuries, in its purest State of doctrine, worship and practice. But it lost its Glory in each of these respects, when the Fathers of the Church began to *wall* it round with Creeds, Articles, &c. The Church of Christ is a religious establishment, builded by him, and the Scripture is its only authentic rule of faith and worship. Whereas (according to this writer) thy Church is a *civil* establishment, builded by our forefathers with Acts of Parliament, upon the foundation of King, Lords and Commons : by their authority alone, it is walled round with Articles, Homilies, and Liturgy, and those Walls are defended by Canons and penal Laws, as it needs them for its support and defence. Upon the whole, friend, our neighbour's ancient Church is only a *Babylonish Structure*, as *Robert Barclay* calleth it ; and thine is an *Ecclesiastical Monarchy*

Monarchy and Common Wealth, as the same writer calleth it."—I shall be glad, Sir, if without quibble or evasion you will help me out of this Dilemma, if you can; that I may again lift up my head among my neighbours, and defend our Church against their attacks, to which you have laid it, and yourself too, so much open.

In p. 51, note [O] you make another malignant attempt to expose the Dr. You refer to the title page of his Sermon, where he styles himself "Chaplain to the late Bp. of St. *Asaph*:" from whence you "presume he can now exercise that office only, on supposition that his Lordship's Soul is in Purgatory, from which in due time it may be released by the prayers of his still surviving Chaplain." In the name of wonder, what hath this remark to do with the Dr's Sermon and Sentiments? Suppose the Dr. had a mind to let the public know that he was Chaplain to, and honoured with the friendship of, the late Bp. of St. *Asaph*, one of the most worthy, amiable and benevolent men that ever sat on the Bench; might not this be allowed him without a sneer?

sneer? If the Dr. had said in his Title page (as in some of his former Sermons) "late Fellow of *Pembroke College Oxford*," which is a similar expression, we had lost this piece of wit: but your remark shows as much ignorance, as it doth malignity; for the ecclesiastical Law is, that "if a Clergyman, having been retained Chaplain to a Peer, hath had any effect of that Retainer, to qualify him for, and procure him, a dispensation, &c. it continueth good, notwithstanding the death of the Peer, who retained him."* So that he may now be "reaping *some* benefit from his title of Chaplain to a dead Prelate."

You and your client Mr. *Romaine*, p. 54, 67, call upon the Dr. to inform the world, what were the *most exceptionable parts* in Mr. *Romaine's* Sermon, which he forbore to mention. Now here, I readily allow that the Dr. wanted his usual prudence. When he used that Phrase, *the least exceptionable*, (tho' I am persuaded his intention therein was kind to Mr. *Romaine*) he did not sufficiently consider what sort of people he had to deal with, and how

* *Grey's Codex*, p. 327. *Burn's Eccl. Law*, Vol. ii. p. 160, 4to.

dangerous it was to come too near a hive of Bees ; for however gentle they seem, however laborious and useful, they are *genus irritabile*, and *can* sting, when a little provoked. Tho' he may now, as some of his Parish do, well remember some *more exceptionable* tenets, than those which he hath mentioned ; yet as he may not be able to recollect all the particular words in which they were expressed, he would probably be charged with falshood, misrepresentation, turning, twisting, and wire-drawing, &c. were he to mention them. There is another, and a surer way to recover, or save, Mr. *Romaine's* character. I do therefore in his name, and the name of all the Parish, call upon Mr. *Romaine* to publish his Sermon. I think, if he consults his own reputation or yours, he will immediately do this. Otherwise, it must be left to our readers, whether they will give greater credit to Dr. *Adams*, or to Mr. *Romaine* and you. I imagine most of them will go by the rule of the Clown, who taking a fancy to hear the latin disputations of Doctors at a University, was asked what judgment he could form of the questions disputed, since he did not under-

understand the language? " For that matter, replied the Clown, I an't such a fool neither, but I can see who's the first that puts t'other in a passion; and I always think he that's most vehement and turbulent hath the worst of the cause."

I now proceed to your *Appendix*, which I must call another malignant attempt to expose Dr. *Adams*, and prejudice his parishioners and friends against him. When you gave us the history of *Arius* from *Mosheim*, you should have honestly told us, what he says, in the very page to which you refer your Readers; namely, that " among the Historians (whom you quote, and whose Histories you say, are of *all others* most approved, p. 56) there is not *one*, to whom the merit of impartiality can be attributed with justice."* You have given us an account of *Arius's* death, which therefore I presume you consider in the same light, as some of his opposers; namely, as a judgment upon him for his Heresy. But thus to interpret the calamities of others is rash and uncharitable, and expressly forbidden by our Sa-

* *Mosheim's Eccl. Hist.* 4to. Vol. i. p. 216, n. m.

viour, *Luke* xiii. 1—5. I could mention to you a very *orthodox German* professor, who died in the same manner.* Had you turned over the next leaf in *Mosheim*, you would have found a more probable account of the cause of *Arius's* death, given by the learned translator of that History, thus; “ The ancient Writers who considered this event as a judgment from Heaven, miraculously drawn down by the prayers of the just to punish the impiety of *Arius*, will find little credit in our time, among those who have studied with attention and impartiality the history of *Arianism*. After having considered this matter with the utmost care, it appears to me extremely probable, that this unhappy man was a victim to the resentment of his enemies, and was destroyed by poison, or some such violent method. A blind and fanatic zeal for certain systems of faith hath in all ages produced such horrible acts of cruelty and injustice.”† I have only to add, that another learned writer, well skilled in that history, seems to be of the same opinion.‡

* *Bayle's Dict. Valla*, with his remarks. † *Mosheim* ib. n. y. ‡ *Jortin* on *Eccl. Hist.* V. iii. p. 111.

I will

I will not take up the Reader's time in following you thro' your history of that, and the other Heresies, tho' it is not impartial and accurate. You have only culled out such particulars of each as you thought would most effectually condemn Dr. *Adams*. Nor shall I enlarge upon the shuffling of *James I.* who warmly opposed *Arminius's* doctrine; wrote against his successor *Vorstius*, and laboured to have the *Arminians* punished in *Holland*: Yet having never felt the good effects of what you represent as a *Heaven-born system*, but being still a bad man and a bad King, afterwards countenanced and favoured them, tho' (as the Author of the *Confessional* observes) there is no evidence that he ever turned *Arminian* in principle. I shall only appeal to our Readers, with what justice you have represented Dr. *Adams* as an *Arian*, because he esteems it an erroneous opinion, that "man stands in need of a Redeemer of *infinite Dignity* to atone for his sins;" when it doth not appear that he hath ever denied the *Divinity of Christ*, but hath (as I showed before) insisted upon it: and tho' you say "he utterly rejects the doctrine of the Trinity"

Trinity" p. 34, you produce no other proof of it, but the passage above-mentioned, which is no proof at all. You ground your opinion indeed in part, on what past in private conversation at his own house, p. 8 : But as we have only the Story on one side, and that much disguised and misrepresented, a true judgment cannot be formed of it.—With what justice can you call him a *Pelagian*, when he allows "the depravity of mankind and their natural propensity to evil, S. p. 26, and directs us to "humble ourselves under a sense of our own unworthiness and the many failings and defects of our best services" p. 38?—With what justice can you represent him as a *Socinian*, when he speaks of the Atonement of Christ; when he again and again ascribes our Salvation to his merits; directs us to "rely upon them for acceptance," and denies that "our best works can give us any claim of right on the Justice of God," p. 19, 30, 38?—Once more, with what justice can you point him out as an *Arminian*, when he recommends to his Hearers to "implore the grace of God's Holy Spirit to assist and sanctify their endeavours; speaks

speaks of the sufficiency of Gospel Grace and of our deriving spiritual strength from Christ," and describes " the humble Believer as one, whose faith leads him to hope in the mercy of God thro' the merits of Christ," p. 31, 38?—If my Readers will be at the trouble, as in justice to the Dr. I hope they will, to compare the account you give us of the Tenets of these Hereticks with the Dr's Sermon, I am persuaded they will see that your representations of him are partial and unjust, and may be fairly numbered among the *malicious words* you have uttered against him. Were I disposed to retaliate, I could by the same method select passages from your Letter, and the Homilies which you quote and declare your concurrence with, and prove you to be a *Tritheist, Sabellian, Patropassian, Necessarian, Fatalist, Antinomian, Solifidian*, and an *Arminian* into the bargain. It might be shown that you agree with each of these Hereticks in some Tenets, and with a few of them in their distinguishing Tenets, tho' I allow you differ from them in others. But I have no design nor desire to expose you, any further than the vindication of the Dr.

obligeth

obligeth me to it; nor can I stoop to such mean and base methods of representation.—But after all, it is not so easy, as you imagine, to determine, nor are the learned agreed, what is the scriptural sense of the word *Heresy*. But it is generally allowed, that it doth not so much refer to the Tenets which a person holds, as to some bad temper, which he sheweth in propagating and defending them. I think a late writer hath given a just and scriptural account of it. “The man who fiercely stickles for opinions of his own; who acts contrary to the peaceable, forbearing, humble spirit of the Gospel; who affects to form a party, and to be thought considerable in it, is so far a Heretick.”* From this description I imagine many will conclude, that not Dr. *Adams*, but his Antagonist, is the real, scriptural Heretick, tho’ he confidently represents many Heresies as “centring in the Dr.” p. 62.

Page 59, note [E] you have objected to the Dr’s observation, that “the end of *all* the institutions and precepts of Religion is holiness of life.” An erroneous and

* *Newton* (of *Olney*’s) Review of *Eccl. Hist.* p. 207.
note y.

dangerous position truly ! one would wonder what objection any Christian could find against this ; especially one who immediately adds, “ I readily agree with the Dr. that without Holiness no man shall see the Lord.” But some *Heresy* must be discovered in it ; and behold, it follows : “ to say that there is no other end proposed by *any* of the doctrines and institutions of the Gospel, than the practice of piety and good works, is to fall into the rankest degree of *Socinianism*, and in effect to deny all need of a propitiatory sacrifice for sin.” But how doth the Dr’s assertion “ deny all need of a propitiatory sacrifice for sin, or, as you express it just before, totally supersede the great end of our Lord’s appearance, to redeem us from the curse of the Law and to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself ? ” One would be glad to know, what end is proposed by *any* of the institutions and precepts of the Gospel, even by the sacrifice of Christ itself, but what centers in this, namely, to promote holiness in us. The very excellency of truth itself lieth in its influence on Holiness, else it is not worth contending for. You justly observe, that “ he died to redeem us from

H the

the curse of the Law, and put away sin by the sacrifice of himself." But is not this saying in other words, that he died to deliver us from a sinful perishing state, and to make us holy and happy? And doth not the Apostle explain his own meaning so, when he saith, " God, sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin (or by being a sacrifice for sin) condemned sin in the flesh," sets us free from its power and dominion, " that the righteousness of the Law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh but after the spirit." *Rom. viii. 3, 4.* The end of the Satisfaction of Christ was, not to appease God and make him propitious; for his love to men found out and accepted the Ransom; but it was to secure the honour of his rectoral justice and moral Government in the sight of his Creatures; to manifest his displeasure against sin, and at the same time display his reconcileableness and the riches of his Grace; and to show how justly vengeance will come upon them who continue unholy. And all this, that sinners might be awakened, convinced and humbled; encouraged to repent and return to God; and have a
constant

constant powerful motive set before them, especially when they receive the Communion, to die unto sin and live unto righteousness. That promoting holiness was the *ultimate end* of the Satisfaction of Christ is the constant language of Scripture: "Christ was made a sin-offering for us, that we might be made *the righteousness of God* in him. He suffered to bring us to God. He gave himself for us to *take away sin*—to deliver us from this present world—to redeem us from *all* iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people, *zealous of good works*. The blood of Christ cleanseth from *all sin*—purgeth the conscience from *dead works* to serve the living God—Christ gave himself for us that we might love one another, and walk in love." There are innumerable passages of this kind. *Grotius, Stillingfleet, Edwards*, and all the other defenders of the satisfaction of Christ against the *Socinians*, have shown, that this appointment was evidently designed and is admirably fitted to promote holiness. What other Idea can we entertain of redemption and salvation, but being made holy, delivered from the guilt and power of sin,

H 2
having

having our natures sanctified, and our whole souls brought into humble subjection to the authority, commands and providence of God, and being made conformable to the image of the holy Jesus, as a necessary qualification for future glory and happiness. To effect this, was the great, the ultimate end of the Satisfaction of Christ. And now, let the Reader judge whether Dr. *Adams* be right or no in his assertion: and I imagine if he considers this point carefully, he will at once see what absurdities and inconsistencies you fall into, by your eager desire, and laborious attempt, to prove the Dr. a *Socinian*.

In p. 61, you say with an undoubting confidence, that Dr. *Adams* "in direct opposition to Scripture and the Church of *England*, sets up human Reason and the dictates of nature, as the *only* infallible guides in matters of spiritual concern." That a Gentleman, a Scholar and a Christian should assert this, doth (in your own words) "astonish me to such a degree, that tho' your Book now lies before me, I can hardly credit my own eyes." I can find nothing in his whole Sermon, that can give you ground for such an assertion. Do
you

you infer this from his calling the Bible “ the word and will of God ? ” from his saying that “ Reason and Conscience in *concurrence* with the Law and the Gospel, prescribe the plain way to Salvation ; that we are to take the light of Reason with us in interpreting Scripture ; that we are to *submit our understanding* to God’s truth how mysterious soever it may appear ; that obedience, in its principle, is a total resignation of the man to the will and law of God, p. 15, 22, 38, 39 ? What a penetration must you have to discover, that he makes human Reason and the dictates of Nature our *only* infallible guide ? From the compliment you pay the Dr. on his Essay against Mr. *Hume*, I presume you have read that Book. Let me remind you of what he there says. “ Reason and Philosophy had tried their strength *in vain* to restore Religion. To the Christian Revelation and to *no other* cause, it is owing, that the great Truths of Nature concerning God, a Providence and a future State are now so widely spread, p. 46. Ed. 3d. What principle hath this Author (Mr. *Hume*) to support virtue and natural religion, when Christianity is taken away ? The best
Philosophy

Philosophy availed but little to reform the religion or morals of mankind. And indeed Religion can never be supported or virtue taught with any force or effect, by the *reasoning of Philosophers.*" He then proceeds to mention the many glorious advantages arising from Christianity for the support of Virtue and Religion, which I must not recite at large, but refer to my Readers' perusal, p. 132, &c. Do I injure you then, if I set down this assertion among the number of your *malicious words*?

Page 64, you assert that "the Dr. contradicts from the Pulpit the very intent and meaning of *every Prayer* which but the moment before he offered up from the Desk." If there had been as much written about the words *intent* and *meaning*, as there hath lately been about the words *Tenor* and *Purport*, I might perhaps have clearly understood this passage. If you mean that the doctrines contained in the Dr's *Harangues from the Pulpit* (as you are pleased to call them p. 62) contradict some doctrines that are contained or implied in the prayers, you only repeat what you had so frequently asserted before: and
it

it seems likely, that you chose to vary your Phraseology as much as you could, the more strongly to prejudice the Dr's Parishioners against him. But if by the *intent of every Prayer* you mean (as the word seems plainly to import) the *end* or *design* which the Prayers of the Church were intended, are used, and are adapted to answer, then your assertion is false. If the intent of those Prayers be to obtain Mercy and Grace from God, and to promote and cherish penitent, humble, pious, holy and benevolent dispositions in the worshippers, then the Dr. is so far from contradicting this intent from the Pulpit, that the whole strain of his preaching concurs with the prayers, and is designed, and calculated to answer the same intent: and I never heard him preach a Sermon but what seemed most evidently adapted to subserve this important purpose. Nor will I except the Sermon, which gave you so much offence, and against which you write.

Thus *various* are your attempts to expose Dr. *Adams's* character. And after this account of them, give me leave seriously to ask, to what purpose can you
 desire

desire that his character should be exposed?
 Are you sure, Sir, that he is not upright-
 ly and piously intending the honour of
 God and the good of Souls in his va-
 rious labours? so sure, that you will ven-
 ture to maintain it at the bar of Christ,
 that he was a person, whom it was *your duty*
 to discredit, and destroy his esteem and use-
 fulness? For considering him as a Chris-
 tian, much more as a Clergyman, it could
 not be merely an *indifferent* action. Nay,
 considering him only as a Man, if it were
 not your *duty*, it was a great *crime*. Like
Diotrephes, you will not *receive* and own,
 him as a Christian Minister, a preacher of
 the Gospel; you in effect *forbid them that*
would, by labouring to render him base in
 the sight of his Parishioners, and prevent
 the success of his labours among them.
 And I fear, if it were in your power, you
 would *cast him out of the Church*. So that I
 think *Diotrephes'* character is with great jus-
 tice and propriety applied to you. And
 whether you do not *love to have the pre-emi-*
nence, let your forwardness to attack so
 many respectable persons of a long standing
 and great eminence in the Church, and the
 whole strain of your Writings against
 them, determine. I have

I have been larger than I intended upon some of the foregoing particulars, because I proposed not only to vindicate the Dr. from your aspersions, but also to set some important Truths of the Gospel in, what I apprehend, their just light, which you have either mistaken or represented in such a manner, as hath a natural tendency to prejudice many against them.—I now judge it needful to add something in vindication of our Church, which I think you have aspersed also. I shall not insist further on the dishonour you have done to the Church by representing it as *built* and *walled* at the Reformation; but observe, that you seem to ascribe that Infallibility to the Church of *England*, which she expressly disclaims, and thro' your whole Letter write, as if the Articles, Liturgy and Homilies of the Church were as much a standard of truth and duty, and as *infallible guides*, as the Scripture. Thus you say, "Our Church *teacheth* us this doctrine, p. 63. Either our own Pastor or *our own* Church must be an unsafe guide, *ib.*" and you generally quote the Articles and Homilies in such a manner, as if they had equal authority, with the

I
Scripture.

Scripture. Now I apprehend this is doing great dishonour to our excellent established Church, especially among unthinking Readers. She doth not pretend to have any doctrines that are properly hers, or peculiar to her; nor can I find that she pretends to be *our guide* at all. The principal thing she teacheth is, that “ Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to Salvation, &c. *Art. vi.* (which I quoted before in my former Remarks) —that many national Churches have erred in matters of Faith, *Art. xix.*—that the Church ought not to enforce any thing to be believed for necessity of Salvation, besides the written word, *Art. xx.*—that things ordained by general Councils, as necessary to Salvation, have neither strength nor authority, unless it may be declared that they be taken out of Holy Scripture,” *Art. xxi.* In her form of *Ordination of Bishops and Priests*, she requires them to profess, “ they are persuaded that the Holy Scriptures contain sufficiently all doctrine required of necessity for eternal Salvation thro’ faith in Jesus Christ;” and that they are “ determined out of the said Scriptures to instruct the People committed to their

their charge, and to teach nothing, as required of necessity to eternal Salvation, but that which THEY SHALL BE PERSUADED, may be concluded and proved by the Scripture. And the Minister is to answer, "I am so persuaded, and have so determined by God's grace."* In her office for Nov. 17th (the accession of Queen *Elizabeth*, as it stands in our old Common Prayer Books) she requires all her Members to make, of especial profession, this one Article, that Christ hath so abundantly taught us all Religion and works in the written word, that we need not *believe* or do any thing but only that which is there taught us. † Agreeably to this you allow that "the only touchstone

I 2

of

* Let me here propose it as a query, whether this passage considered as the Dr's answer to the Bishop, when he put these questions to him, doth not fully vindicate him in contradicting the Articles, Homilies, and even Prayers of the Church, if he is not *persuaded*, that what they contain may be proved by Scripture? How can it be said (as you do p. 62) that "Dr. *Adams* upon his knees at his Ordination most solemnly bound himself to defend all the Doctrines of the Church of *England*?" I can find no such bond in the form of Ordination: he bound himself to "banish and drive away all erroneous and strange Doctrines contrary to *God's Word*." He also bound himself to "teach nothing as necessary to Salvation, but what *he should be persuaded* might be proved from Scripture."

† *Whitby's* Serm. on *Deut.* xxix. 29.

of divine truth is the written word of God." It seems to me, therefore, that you are rather inconsistent with yourself and with the Church, and do in effect contradict and dishonour her, while you quote, and appeal to, her Articles and Homilies, just as you do the written Word: and this, not meerly to condemn the Dr. for differing from her (tho' she herself allows and commands him to do it, if *he* thinks she is wrong) but to prove and support your own Tenets; which is plainly one end you have in view thro' your whole Letter. But I do not wonder at this conduct in you; for I have read that the learned Bp. *Morley*, when he was speaking of the *Protestant Religion* before the House of Lords, defined it to be " the thirty nine Articles, the Liturgy, the Catechism, the Homilies and the Canons of the Church of *England*:"† a Definition, which no foreign Protestant, and I hope not many of the Church of *England*, would ever have thought of.

As a proof that the Church of *England* disowns Infallibility, it may be observed, that she hath changed her Doctrine since

* *Oldmixon's Hist.* Vol. i. p. 590.

the Reformation ; and now differs from all the Reformers and Compilers of her Liturgy in a very material point. Her Doctrine now is, and she obligeth all the Clergy to declare their assent and consent to it, that “ it is evident unto all men, diligently reading the Holy Scripture, and ancient authors, that from the Apostles’ time, there have been these *orders* of Ministers in Christ’s Church, Bishops, Priests and Deacons.” But on this Point the Reformers thought and taught otherwise. *Wickliff, Lambert, Tindal, Barnes, Cranmer, Thirlby, Redman, Cox, Jewel, &c.* agreed, that Episcopacy was not a distinct Order from Presbytery: But Bishops and Presbyters differed only in *degree*. The Book entitled, *The Institution of a Christian Man*, made by the whole Clergy in their provincial Synod, 1537, set forth by the authority of the King and Parliament, and commanded to be read and preached thro’ the whole Kingdom, declares the same. Agreeably, the Reformers and their immediate Successors did not re-ordain those, who had been ordained by Presbyters.* The Notion of Episco-

* *Stillingfleet’s Iren. Burnet’s Collect. Part I. p. 228.*

pacy,

pacy, as a *distinct* and *superiour Order*, was first brought into the Church by Archbishop *Laud*, and tho' he was much opposed in it by many eminent Divines, as Dr. *Holland* and Archbishop *Usher*, yet about 1660 it became the established Doctrine of the Church, and still continues to be so, tho' the ancient custom of the Presbyters laying their hands on the ordained together with the Bishop is not altered. Now, if in so important a point as this, which affects almost all the other Protestant Churches in the World, the Church of *England* hath differed, and still differs, from the venerable Reformers, and Compilers of the Liturgy, from all those holy Martyrs, who sealed the truth with their blood, she cannot pretend to be an infallible guide and teacher; and it cannot be criminal, as you often insinuate it is, to differ from those glorious men in other points.

You likewise do dishonour to the Church of *England*, by representing a Member of it as saying, "into *this* Church I have been baptised in my Infancy," p. 65. But doth the Church really monopolize that sacred Ordinance? Doth she understand so little of its nature, or of catholick Christianity, as to consider it as a badge of be-

longing to that Church alone ; as only an Ordinance of Initiation into one particular Church, because she administers it in a Form, and with Rites, peculiar to herself? No, Sir, she is more consistent and catholic. In the Office of Baptism, she speaks of the baptised, as *received* (not into the Church of *England*, but) *into the Congregation of Christ's flock*, as *grafted into the body of Christ's Church*, *incorporated into God's holy Church*. And in her Catechism, Children are taught to say, that by their Baptism they were *made Members of Christ*, not of this Church.* But I can easily guess from what Party you picked up this narrow expression ; as I have often heard and read, that the high-flying Clergy make use of this, as a most weighty argument why their Flock should not turn Papists or Presbyterians, nor even go to a Conventicle, because “ they were *baptised into the Church of England*.” It seems probable from the whole strain of your Writings, that you believe *you* were baptised into the Church of *England*. Give me leave in this connection to quote an observation of Dr. *Adams* ; “ A deference to Authority

* 1 Cor. i. 13—16.

whe-

whether publick or private, a prejudice to opinions in which we have *been educated*, or which we have long entertained, will bias the mind to error. But where these Principles have no influence, Truth will be fairly heard, and the faith of men will be generally proportioned to the evidence that appears. Where men believe and entertain Opinions *contrary* to the influence of these Principles, it is a fair presumption, that their faith is well grounded, and that their assent is extorted by the force of truth.* I imagine judicious Readers will perceive, that the former part of this Observation is applicable to you, and the latter to the Dr.

In p. 53, 54, you call upon the Dr. with the air of one *who loves to have the pre-eminence*, to “ answer your Letter, not by clandestine attacks in St. Chad’s Pulpit, but by coming out on fair ground.” Had only the Parishioners of St. Chad’s heard Mr. Romaine’s Sermon, it is probable the Dr’s had never gone beyond the walls of the Church. But when so many persons were collected together from the neighbouring Parishes and congrega-

* Essay against *Hume*, p. 101, 102. Ed. 3d.

tions,

tions to hear Mr. *Romaine*, it seemed proper that the Dr. should publish his Sermon for their information and benefit, if they will read it; especially as thereby he obliged some of his friends, who urged him to publish it, and who are an honour to his parish and to christianity. So far then he "came out on fair ground," and did not, as you *elegantly* express it, "content himself with having crowed upon his own dunghill." He hath since vindicated himself from the pulpit against your censures and misrepresentations, to the full satisfaction of those of his Parishioners, with whom I am acquainted. Nor can you properly complain of this as "a clandestine attack," considering how numerous the auditory is, and that you have one or more *credible* informers, p. 9, who will undoubtedly take care to let you know what he saith upon the subjects in debate. I imagine, that no one, who hath attentively read your Letter, especially the *second* or *third* Edition (for I presume they are one and the same) and hath observed your spirit, and who also knoweth the Dr. will wonder, that a person of his age, temper, and station, with so many important cares, labours, and

unavoidable avocations daily pressing upon him, should decline entering into any controversy with you; especially as perhaps he may think himself sufficiently vindicated by his parishioner.

And now, Sir, I will trouble you and my Readers no longer, and I hope no more, on this subject. It was impossible to do justice to the Dr's Character and Sermon, without pointing out your misrepresentations and ungrounded aspersions: and this hath the appearance of Asperity, which I would desire and endeavour to avoid. But if ever some warmth is justifiable, it is in the vindication of a worthy and amiable Character, when it is virulently attacked from the Press, and the Writer seems solicitous, and even goes out of his way, to blacken and sink it. For this attempt, you may still think, that I am as great a Heretick as the Dr. It will, however, be some satisfaction to me (as you express it, p. 44) to be "condemned in very good company." Probably you will not believe me, tho' I repeat the declaration, that I do not approve all the Sentiments in his Sermon, and in other points differ from him. But your judgment or censures of me, will give me little concern.

I shall take your advice, and not be “af-frighted by bug-bear names” [*Dedicat.*] It is a small thing with me to be judged of man’s judgment. But whatever esteem I have for the Dr. whatever veneration I have for the Articles, Liturgy, and Homilies of our Church, I have greater for my Bible: and will sooner give up all the human Articles, Creeds, and Compositions in the world, than the Oracles of God. Dr. *Adams* is the Vicar of my Parish. I have attended his Labours with pleasure, and I hope, improvement: But he is not my Master; Christ alone is so. I am truly grieved to see some doctrines of the Gospel, which I esteem important and indeed fundamental, and most subservient to the interest of true Holiness and every good work, misrepresented by you, and in danger of being given up and ridiculed by some, and perverted by others, in consequence of your misrepresentations. I esteem your Principles, in the extreme to which you and some of the Homilies carry them, to be quite *Antinomian*; at least very dangerous to practical Religion; and must say with the great Lord *Falkland*, “An ill Life followeth

very consequentially from the high calvinistical principle; and that those who hold it must be *bad Logicians*, if they are *good men*.* — If you chuse to proceed in controversial writing, let me intreat you, for your own sake, for the sake of your friends (many of whom, I know, are heartily sorry that you have attempted to defend their Tenets with so much bitterness) for the sake of our excellent established Church, for the sake of evangelical doctrines, and the honour and advancement of practical religion, and especially christian charity, that you apply more diligently to the study of your Bible, and “ be careful not to search the Scriptures by halves;” that when you quote texts in defence of your own opinions, or to confute your opponents, that you examine their contexts and the design of the sacred writers, comparing Scripture with Scripture, and not Scripture with Articles and Homilies, which are not *the faith once delivered to the Saints*. Let me also intreat you, to keep a constant guard upon your pen and temper; to review your compositions narrowly, before you com-

* Defence of the Discourse on Infallibility.

mit them to the Press; and take more time than *a Week* for composing and reviewing, if you would not affront the publick and injure your own cause; especially that you endeavour in meekness to confute and instruct those that oppose themselves, if you think yourself called by Providence to attempt it. And I particularly urge this latter advice, that you may show the falshood of a well-known remark of Archbishop *Tillotson*, that “ a man who hath once drawn blood in controversy, is seldom known ever perfectly to recover his good temper afterwards.”

“ I shall only add (and you at least cannot call me uncharitable for adding it p. 66) that I pray God, Sir, to give you repentance to the acknowledgment of the truth, that you may make a publick and speedy recantation of what you have advanced to the dishonour of Christ, and the disturbance of his Church;” and of the great indignity you have offered, and the injury you have done, to one of his Ministers and Servants; and subscribe myself,

S I R,

Your sincere well-wisher,

SALOPIENSIS.

P O S T S C R I P T.

SINCE these Remarks went to the Press, I have received your Admonition, and paid all due attention to it. But I have little more to add upon the Subjects, concerning which you write. It must remain with our Readers to judge, whether I “ have an hearty aversion to the principles of the Reformation and the Doctrines of the established Church,” which you say, is “ so clear that nothing can be clearer,” p. 7.—You observe in a note p. 9, that “ my Apology for Dr. *Adams* in not reading the Athanasian Creed, that it would *displease his Parishioners*, is hardly reconcileable with the mind of the Apostle, *if I yet pleased men, I should not be the Servant of Christ.*” And your observation would be right, if the Dr. thought the explication therein given of the Trinity was quite intelligible to all, very important, and necessary to Salvation; and that it was proper to introduce that explication and the damnatory clauses into the worship of the Church: for then he would comply with

with men's prejudices and please them contrary to his own judgment and views of the Gospel, which is what the Apostle means in the passage you quote. But his omitting it while he thinks the contrary, is quite reconcileable with, and agreeable to, the Apostle's principles and conduct *in pleasing his neighbour for his good, to edification, Rom. xv. 2, in becoming all things to all men, 1 Cor. ix. 19, 22, and pleasing all men in all things, that they may be saved. x. 33.*—Your repeated charges against the Dr. p. 10, in which you proceed in misrepresenting him, I have already considered; and shall only observe that the Dr. esteems, not an Article of the Church but, your throwing it at him, *meer brutum fulmen.*—You seem, p. 15, to have a better opinion of the sentiments of *any Papist*, even the greatest visionary, or bloodiest Inquisitor; of *Dominic, Bonner, Ravilliac* or *Damien*, than “those of an *Arian, Pelagian, or Socinian*,” tho’ ever so moderate and benevolent in his temper and unblameable in his conduct; and think the sentiments of the former, “not farther, nor half so far, removed from the Church of *England*,” as those of the latter.

ter. Agreeably, in your Letter Ed. 2. p. 61, you assert that “ the four Heresies” of *Arius*, *Pelagius*, *Socinus*, and *Arminius* “ are the only ones of *any note* that ever pestered Christianity.” You choose to overlook the Heresies of the Papists; their asserting the supremacy and Infallibility of the *Pope*, whom the Scripture calls *Antichrist*, *the Man of sin*, and *the Son of Perdition*—their denying the use of the Scripture to the Laity, and setting up Tradition and the Determinations of their Church as a Rule of Faith—their adding to the Sacraments which Christ ordained—their abominable Idolatries, in worshipping Angels, Saints, Images, Relicks, and a piece of Bread—and their detestable Principle that no Faith is to be kept with Hereticks, but that they are all to be destroyed and extirpated: These you esteem Heresies of *no note*; tho’ so expressly forbidden and condemned in the word of God. Here you yourself differ *toto cælo* from all the Reformers, and contradict the Church of *England* in her Articles and Homilies, which speak with just abhorrence of some of these Tenets of Popery, as the worst Heresies. But as
this

this seems to be a darling Sentiment with you, I must leave you to enjoy it; yet I imagine you will find few Protestants, who will esteem it an honour to you or the Church to which you belong, that you have endeavoured to soften the most exceptionable, absurd, and dangerous Tenets of *Popery*, as if they were Heresies and Errors of *no note*, while you asperse some of the ablest defenders of the Protestant cause among us, and endeavour to lessen the good influence of their writings. Is this an act of friendship to our *truly apostolical Church*? [Dedicat.] A worthy divine of that Church, in your way of thinking, hath observed, “ The beginnings of that spiritual infatuation, which so long detained the World in chains, darkness, and slavery under the tyranny of the church of *Rome*, were observable in *St. Paul’s* time, and therefore deserved a place in the list of those *pestilent Heresies*, by which the enemy of Souls attempted to defile the faith and disturb the peace of the primitive church.”* A very different idea of *Popery* from yours, and more agreeable to the doctrine of our church!

* *Newton’s Review of Eccl. Hist.* p. 347.

Oh! Sir, you are the Person, who have need to blush, if ever you blushed in your life p. 15," for charging me most wrongfully. You in effect charge me with "daring to put the everlasting unchangeable truths of the Gospel upon a footing with old University Statutes and obsolete Acts of Parliament." But I neither put the everlasting truths of the Gospel, nor even the Articles and Homilies of the Church upon that footing; yet I do, and will, and must, make a vast difference between the Authority of the everlasting truths of the Gospel, and that of Articles and Homilies of Man's drawing up, tho' you seem to make little. I put the subscribing and assenting to the particular phrases, words and syllables of human Articles and Homilies, and to the sense, in which the Compilers used them, upon something of a like footing with swearing to keep old University Statutes, that cannot be kept; and swearing to execute obsolete Acts of Parliament. And this, in order to show, that if a latitude be allowed and taken in one case, it seemeth not wicked to take it in the other. And as our Law or Governours "leave (you say) a discretion" in

in one case, they do it as much in the other, since they take no notice of those, who you think ought to be animadverted upon. The Articles are subscribed and assented to by the Clergy. Students at the Universities swear to keep old Statutes, that cannot be kept. Justices of the Peace swear to keep and cause to be kept, obsolete Acts of Parliament. Now, as far as the act of subscribing, assenting, and swearing, affects the conscience or character of each, where is the material difference? Why must one be charged with prevarication for subscribing, what they do not believe in the sense of the Compilers (tho' it is alledged they do it, in the sense of the present enforcers and receivers of their Subscriptions); and yet the others not be deemed guilty of prevarication and perjury in swearing to do, what they know in their consciences they cannot do? The Clergy seem more vindicable, because they subscribe and assent to that, on which, they say, they can put a fair and good sense. Tho' the particular Acts to which I referred, are repealed, the Argument was good while they continued in force: And it is good still, with regard to old Univer-

sity Statutes and obsolete Acts of Parliament, while the same Oaths are required of Students and Justices without alteration, as were formerly.—If you chuse to reply to these Remarks, allow me again to call upon you to declare, how the Clergymen of your Sentiments satisfy themselves to subscribe, and *declare their unfeigned assent and consent* to plain contradictions? And to those, which I have already pointed out, in my former address p. 37, 38, I will now add, that the Athanasian Creed and Burial-office, in effect, contradict one another—that the manner in which these Clergymen explain the doctrine, and urge the necessity of Regeneration, contradicts the Offices of Baptism, Confirmation and the Catechism—that the rule for finding Easter is esteemed and hath been proved by some learned Astronomers to be sometimes false.—These they subscribe and assent to: nor do these Clergymen, I presume, “say morning and evening Prayer in the Churches, where they minister, when at home and not otherwise reasonably hindered,” as the Common Prayer-Book requireth.

Your

Your long parallel p. 12—14, of the case of a *Popish* Priest subscribing the Articles with the latitude pleaded for, will hardly hold. The Clergy of the Church of *England* do many of them believe and profess, that they can and do put such a fair sense upon the Articles, that they can with a good conscience subscribe them: but a *Popish* Priest can put no sense upon some of them but what would evidently contradict his known principles, except he had the effrontery to say, that two and seven were the same. I am truly sorry that the worthy peaceable pious Clergy are put under any difficulty of this kind, and think it high time the Church of *England* should imitate the Church of *Geneva* in abolishing their Subscriptions, or insist only on the Clergy's subscribing the Bible. For tho' requiring such Subscriptions may and doth, keep out some worthy and conscientious men from the Ministry of the Church, and reduces others, who do subscribe, to some difficulties and exposes them to censure; yet it will never keep out Hypocrites. An orthodox Gentleman who lived not fifty Miles from hence, having some money to distribute among the Clergy, sent for two
of

of them, whom he knew to be in strait circumstances. He informed them of his intention to serve them; but added, "you must, before you receive the money, subscribe such and such doctrinal Articles: " Mr. *A.* will you subscribe?" "No, Sir, nothing but my Bible."—Then you shall have no money. Mr. *B.* will you subscribe?—"Whatever you please, Sir," saith Mr. *B.* Then, adds the Gentleman, you shall have the money, and I will other ways be a friend to you.

In your *note*, p. 23, you make a distinction between *discipline* and *persecution*, which is so fine drawn, that it cannot be easily understood, as an affair of that importance should be. I readily allow that the discipline of the Church, and the State too, should be inflicted on *immoral practices*. But I cannot see that either State or Church hath any thing to do with *erroneous doctrines*, which are not injurious to the peace of Society. The Protestant principle on this head is, that "none are to be subjected to civil penalties in any degree whatsoever, meerly on account of their Religious opinions, or even practices arising from them, if they
are

are not detrimental to the peace of Society, which the Magistrate by his Office is obliged to preserve, and injurious to the persons or properties of others." A man ought not, on account of his religious principles whatever they may be, to be abridged in those liberties which peaceable Subjects are entitled to. And if your Sentiments differ from these, I cannot see how they can be reconciled with those of a Christian and a Protestant. A certain writer saith, of the Church of *Scotland*, that " she hath a very strong Stomach for *dominion* : but sweetens it with a soft name, and calls it *discipline*, which she exercises with little tenderness upon such as offend her and gainsay her." I think it is for the honour of the Church of *England*, that her discipline in *this* respect is *totally relaxed*. Tho', on the same Protestant principles, I must agree with you, that " whoever suffers for his attachment to her doctrines or nonconformity to wicked customs, is persecuted for righteousness sake." Your expression of *disturbing the peace of the Church* hath an ill sound ; as it hath formerly been urged as an argument by *Papists* and many called *Protestants*,
for

for restraining and punishing all sorts of Dissenters from the Church, that they *disturbed its peace*. But how doth this affect Dr. *Adams*? I think you cannot produce an instance, in which he hath disturbed the peace of the Church by his *erroneous doctrines*. I know he hath done much to promote and preserve it by his candour and benevolence. He hath well fulfilled his solemn promise at his Ordination “to maintain and set forward, as much as lieth in him quietness peace and love among all Christians, and especially among them that are committed to his charge.” *Weak Bigots* and *fiery Zealots* are the real disturbers of the Church. How is its peace affected by a quiet *Arian*, *Socinian*, or *Pelagian* Divine, any more than by a quiet *Athanasian*, *Calvinistical*, or *Hutchinsonian* Divine? If either is fiery and turbulent, and will not let his neighbours peaceably enjoy their own sentiments; if he strives and rails and censures those that differ from him, *he is the disturber*. From this Note, compared with your Letter to the Dr. I think every attentive Reader must perceive, that you secretly wish the Dr. was brought under the

the discipline of the Church; and you have now confirmed, what I expressed my apprehension of before, that you answer the character of *Diotrephes* exactly, and would *cast him out of the Church*. But you had need, Sir, carefully to examine such principles and such a disposition: for, if this be really your Tenet, it agrees indeed with the Sentiments of most of the Reformers, but is most diametrically opposite to the whole Gospel, and leads down to the chambers of blood.*

You complain p. 24, that “ a Discourse conformable to the doctrines of the established Church, may be attacked as *rash, arrogant, delusive, uncharitable, &c.* expressions all quoted from Dr. *Adams's* Sermon [tho' I cannot find them all there] without being thought unbecoming, &c. Yet when the prevarication of those, who oppose these Tenets is exposed, then the cry of *imprudence, heat, scurrility, abuse, want of charity, &c.* shall be heard on every side.” This is spe-

* The true Religion hath suffered rather from the *relaxation* of the *Church-discipline* than from severity. So said that bloody persecutor, *Laud*, at his Trial. *Macaulay's Hist. V. iv. p. 140.*

cious, and will easily deceive a bigoted or a superficial reader. But an impartial judicious reader will soon perceive a wide difference between you and Dr. Adams: And I must intreat the careful attention of all my readers to this difference. Dr. Adams describes the nature, absurdity and evil tendency of those Doctrines which he disapproves, in some of the language, which you quote from his Sermon. But then he saith nothing reflecting upon the hearts, or even the general character, of those, who propagate them; only blames the *undoubting confidence*, the *imperious decisive air*, and the *rash unguarded expressions*, with which they propagate them. On the contrary, he, as I observed before, expresseth his abhorrence of *censuring and condemning all*, who embrace or propagate those Doctrines; allows many of them to be *eminent for piety and virtue*, and bears an honourable Testimony to their *irreproachable lives and zealous labours*. This is real, genuine, consistent charity. To do justice to the general character and conduct, and speak and think favourably

bly of the views, designs and hearts, of those, whose tenets we think ourselves obliged to disapprove and condemn ; this is evangelical charity. And it shows, by the way, how easily Dr. *Adams's* preaching and publishing this offensive Sermon may be reconciled, with his expressions of *candour, forbearance, and the most extensive charity to those who differ in opinion from him, tho' you think it by no means to be reconciled to them*, p. 26.—

You, on the other hand, not only condemn Dr. *Adams's* Tenets, but censure him *personally*, as insincere, prevaricating, &c. &c. You take upon you to judge *his heart*, seem to number him among the carnal and unregenerate, and actually represent him, and *all others* without exception, who do not embrace your system, as strangers to the life and power, the consolations and hopes of Christianity, *Let.* p. 49, 50. Ed. 2d. This I call, and I think every sensible reader must call, *rash, arrogant, uncharitable*. It is directly the reverse of *true evangelical Charity*, and hath *something diabolically horrible in it*, p. 28.—That you have

this ill opinion of Dr. *Adams's* heart, seems to be insinuated p. 28, 29, 30. I cannot dive into your meaning, except it be to prove, that he, with all his *external decency and regularity*, his being a man of learning, benevolence, and a friend to Society, and *superiour to grovelling mean gratifications*, is nevertheless an unregenerate carnal man, and *equally as far from real conversion to God, as the most abandoned profligate*, p. 38. Your repeated quotation from *Fuller*, that "the poison of heretical Doctrines is never more dangerous, than when served up in clean cups and washed dishes," seems, in that connection, plainly to import this. If this be the case, it requires no great penetration to judge, whether yours is *true evangelical charity*, or a *counterfeit charity*.

In p. 33, you represent my query "what were the dispensations to *Adam, Noab, Abraham, Job, &c.*" as a childish one. It is a common saying, "a child may ask more questions, than a wise man can answer." I called your assertion, that "it is certain there were no other dispensations from all eternity but *the Law* and

and *the Gospel*" rash and inaccurate. It was *rash* to say it so confidently, since we know, and can know, so little of the dispensations to *Adam, Noah, &c.* It was *inaccurate*, because you say there were no other but *the Law* and *the Gospel*. By *the Law* you undoubtedly mean the Law of *Moses*, as *St. Paul* refers to it in the text you quote. Now as those persons lived before that Law, they must according to you, be under the dispensation of *the Gospel*: and one would be glad to know what kind of *Gospel dispensation* it was, as this would explain some difficult passages of Scripture, and perhaps solve some problems in divinity. A modest writer would hardly take upon him to say what you have asserted.

Page 34, I called your long harangue *a strange and shocking* one with great justice. Not because of the plain declarations of Scripture, but because of your comment upon them; which is, that all those institutions or appointments would appear to Reason unworthy of God, and some of them ridiculous in themselves. I referred you to *Tindall*, and must again

gain refer you to him, or his answerers, that you may see what an ill use Infidels make of such harangues.*

As to my own religious principles and Tenets, you may judge of them what you please. I honour Mr. *Baxter*, I honour Archbishop *Tillotson*, and all other pious, moderate, and peaceable men, whether in or out of the Church of *England*. I am an enemy to the pitiful distinction of Parties. I never read one of Mr. *Baxter's* controversial Books; and if he was "an avowed enemy to the church of *England*," p. 35, which I am persuaded he was not, he met with great friendship and countenance from some of its most worthy Members, particularly Bp. *Wilkins*, and Sir *Matthew Hale*; and had honourable testimonies borne to his worth by Abp. *Tillotson*, Bp. *Stillingfleet*, Drs. *Barrow*, *Glanville*, *Sherlock*, &c. His practical writings I

* You will find some others of my mind, particularly the authors of the *monthly Review*; who say, "*this Author hath seconded the most daring attempts of the Free-thinkers; and we shall not transcribe the passages, because we would not be accessory to the furnishing out so rich an entertainment to the enemies of Revelation.*" *Review for April 1770*, p. 334.

esteem and admire. By a *Seēt* he doth not mean a separation only, but a Party formed in a Church in favour of particular Tenets, to the disturbance of the peace of that Church and the destruction of that Charity which Christians of different sentiments ought to have for one another. Accordingly he useth the word *Seēt and Party* promiscuously and as synonymous terms, in that Section, part of which I quoted. And you must allow me to say, that you have done much to breed a division and schism of the worst kind in the church of *England* (for your Greek Testament will show you, that there may be a schism *in* a Church, without separation *from* it *) by misrepresenting and traducing some of its greatest ornaments, prejudicing people against their Ministers as well as one another, and destroying their reputation and usefulness. Thus you are, in Mr. *Baxter's* sense, and indeed in the worst sense of the word, a *seētariſt*; and his advice in your case is very salutary.

* John ix. 16. 1 Cor. i. 10. xi. 18.

Whether I am, or am not, a Dissenter, p. 35, 36, is of no consequence. You are at liberty to attack my avowed principles. I will only tell you, that if I am a member of the established Church, I am not a high Churchman, nor *weakly bigoted* to its forms and ceremonies; and I live upon peaceable and friendly terms with my dissenting Neighbours. If I am a Dissenter, I am no enemy to the Church of *England*, unless you esteem all Dissenters its enemies; else Dr. *Adams* and some other very respectable Clergymen of that Church, would not honour me with their friendship.—I have not concealed my *real* Sentiments in the matters controverted between you and the Dr; and as for what you call a *mean artifice* to do it, it is perhaps most advantageous to the cause I am pleading to keep myself concealed. You well know that it is usual for anonymous writers to personate what profession or denomination is most favourable to their designs. Did you ever hear of any one that *despised* the learned Dr. *Bentley*, because in his judicious and full answer to *Collins's Essay on Free-thinking*,
 he

he called himself *Phileleutherus Lipsiensis*, and wrote under a character correspondent to that name, even as a *Lutheran Divine*? But you want to be sure what profession and religious persuasion I am of, that you may fix on something *personal*, have a better opportunity to treat me, as you have done the Dr. and *shoot out your Arrows, even bitter words*. I am therefore desirous to save you, as far as possible, from further exposing yourself.

I leave the Ministers you condemn p. 37, entirely to your mercy, and have not a word to say in their favour. They are the proper subjects of Church-discipline; tho' those of them that are *frequently found in Pot-houses*, may and ought to be disciplined by the Justices of the Peace.

I will now, Sir, take my leave of you and my Readers, with again urging upon their minds and yours a thought, which I esteem of very great importance at all times, and especially in such a controversy as this. And that you may not think me disaffected to the Church of *England*, I will give it in the words of Archbishop

N

Wake,

Wake, whose attachment to the Church, especially after he became *Primate*, was never doubted: "In matters of *Faith*, a man is to judge for himself; and the Scriptures are a *clear* and *sufficient* Rule for him to judge by. Therefore if a man be evidently convinced, upon the best inquiry he can make, that *his particular belief* is founded upon the *Word of God*, and that of *the Church* is not, he is obliged to support and adhere to *his own belief*, in opposition to that of *the Church*. The reason of this must be very evident to all, who own, not the *Church*, but the *Scriptures*, to be the ultimate Rule and Guide of *their Faith*. If they are convinced that there is a disagreement in *any points* of Faith, between the voice of *the Church* and that of *Scripture*, they must stick to the *latter*, rather than the *former*. They must follow the *superiour*, not the *inferiour*, Guide. This method is most just and reasonable, and most agreeable to the *Constitution of the Church of England*, which doth not take upon her to be *absolute Mistress* of her members, but allows a higher place and authority

authority to the guidance of the *Holy Scripture*, than to that of *her own Decisions*."*

While I am finishing this Postscript, I am glad to peruse another Letter to you from a very sensible and candid Writer, and to find that he intends to proceed, in a series of Letters, to examine your assertions and censures. His learning and abilities, so much superiour to mine, will enable him to execute this design in a manner more honourable to Dr. *Adams* and our Church, more acceptable to the publick, and more subservient to the interests of truth, holiness and love, than my cursory remarks could be. I am therefore glad to leave you and the cause in his hands, and heartily wish him success in this very laudable design.

* *Wake's Defence of the Exposition of the Doctrine of the Church of England, against Bossuet, p. 81, &c.*

T H E E N D.

Just Published,

*And sold by B. WHITE, in Fleet-Street;
T. CADELL, in the Strand, London; and
J. EDDOWES, in Shrewsbury.*

*A Test of true and false Doctrines. A
Sermon preached in the Parish
Church of St. Chad, Salop; on September
24, 1769. By William Adams, D. D.
The second Edition. Price 6 d.*

*Diotrephes Admonished: or some Re-
marks on a Letter from the Author of
Pietas Oxoniensis to the Rev. Dr. Adams,
of Shrewsbury; occasioned by the Publi-
cation of his Sermon preached at St. Chad's,
entitled, A Test of true and false Doctrines.
By a Parishioner of St. Chad's. Price 1 s.*

*The First of a Series of Letters to the
Author of Pietas Oxoniensis, in Answer to
his Letter to the Rev. Dr. Adams, of
Shrewsbury; occasioned by the Publica-
tion of his Sermon, entitled A Test of true
and false Doctrines. Price 9 d.*